



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,337	08/03/2001	John Blair	KM2158.001CP1	8212
20995 7590 12/26/2008 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER				
WINTER, JOHN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3685				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/26/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com

eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,337

Applicant(s)

BLAIR ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN M. WINTER

Art Unit

3685

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 11, 36 and 41-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 11, 36 and 41-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

The Applicants amendment filed on September 11, 2008 is hereby acknowledged, Claims 10, 11, 36 and 41-62 remain pending..

Response to Arguments

1. The Applicant's states that Archibald does not disclose aggregating of content data objects.

The Examiner responds that Archibald states " FIG. 5 illustrates an example of multiple programs 200-204 being combined into one digital application 212 and payment distribution therefor. The example shown in FIG. 5 assumes that a collection agency exists as well as the infrastructure support shown in FIGS. 1 and 2. As shown, programs 1-3 200-204 each include an application identification field 206-210. A particular software vendor (i.e., publisher) may combine programs 1, 2 and 3 into a digital application 212. Within the digital application 212, the vendor will include an application identification field 214. The application identification field 214 will identify programs 1, 2 and 3 as well as any individual contributions the vendor added. "(Column 10, lines 1-13). The Examiner submits that the discloses method of " combining programs into a digital application" fully meets the claimed limitation of "aggregating of content data objects".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 11 ,36 and 41-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole, Jr. et al. (US Patent 6,279,112) in view of Archibald et al (US Patent 5,825,883) and further in view of Heindel et al.(US Patent 6,304,857) *St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

3. As per claim 10,

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) discloses a method for transmitting content data over a computer network comprising

providing a first interface to a publisher to define content data objects;

providing a second interface to a user of a client computer to select content data objects from the publisher;(Figure 2)

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112)does not explicitly disclose processing the content data objects that were selected for transmission according to a -format requested by the user and aggregating the content data objects that were selected from one or more of the plurality in response to the a request from the user. Archibald et al ('883), discloses processing the content data objects that were selected for transmission according to a -format requested by the user (Figure 1, column 3, lines 56-67)and aggregating the content data objects that

were selected from one or more of the plurality in response to the a request from the user. (Column 10, lines 1-13; figure 5); it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the O'Toole, Jr. et al. With the Archibald et al ('883) method in order to allow the merchant to realize a profit from the transaction. O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) does not explicitly disclose providing a switching network to transmit the content data objects that were selected from the publisher to the user upon request from the user; and for causing transfer of a portion of a payment from the user to each of the publishers the content data objects that were selected, Heindel et al. ('857), discloses providing a switching network to transmit the content data objects that were selected from the publisher to the user upon request from the user; and for causing transfer of a portion of a payment from the user to each of the publishers the content data objects that were selected, (Column 8, lines 10-39); it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the O'toole, Jr. et al. with the Heindel et al. ('857) method in order to allow the merchant to offload the cost of processing billing transactions.

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) discloses the claimed invention except for "providing a third interface to and the user to select payment terms and conditions for the transmission of the content data objects that were selected from the publisher to the user", It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a third interface, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

4. Claims 11, 36 and 41-62 are not patentably distinct from claim 10 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN M. WINTER whose telephone number is (571)272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt can be reached on (571) 272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMW
/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685